REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 stand rejected. Claim 21 has been amended in this paper to correct an antecedent basis problem.

The specification stands objected to, and has been amended in this paper in response to the objections.

Applicants believes the amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Each of the Examiner's rejections is founded on a base combination of U.S. Patent No. 2,767,944 to Moore, and U.S. Patent No. 3,426,986 to Pool. Moore '944 discloses a vertical axis washing machine having a generally rectilinear (in plan view) base frame 11, 12 supported on a plurality of floor-engaging feet. Three of the feet are primary supporting feet 15, 16, 17 which define the apices of an equilateral triangle, and which support the washing machine in a condition of stable equilibrium. Two of the primary supporting feet 15, 17 are located at two adjacent corners of the rectilinear base frame11, 12. The third primary supporting foot 16 is located at the midpoint of an opposing wall.

The remaining two corners of the base frame 11, 12 are occupied by a pair of auxiliary self-adjusting feet 22, 23 on either side of the third primary supporting foot 16. These feet 22, 23 comprise a threaded shank 24 terminating in a disk-like foot 25. The foot 25 is enclosed in a cylindrical shell 26 having an aperture 28 in a top wall 27 through which the shank 24 movably extends. The interior of the shell 26 surrounding the foot 25 is occupied by "a permanently plastic and putty-like resilient composition of high viscosity." Moore '944, col. 1, ln. 50-55. Under a prolonged applied stress, such as a static load, tending to change the shape of the material, the material behaves as a highly plastic material, with

fluid flow into a new shape. Under suddenly applied stresses, such as dynamic or vibratory loads, the material is highly elastic, with little or no fluid flow.

Under static loading conditions, the load is supported on the primary supporting feet 15, 16, 17. The auxiliary self-adjusting feet 22, 23 are positioned so that the shell 26 just touches the floor, in an unloaded condition. Under unloaded conditions, such as would occur when the washing machine is not operating, the foot 25 is suspended in the center of the viscous material. When the washing machine is operating, the highly resilient character of the viscous material resists sudden dynamic changes in the position of the foot relative to the base frame 11, 12. . The high viscosity fluid flow enables the feet 22, 23 to adjust to a new position under a prolonged, static load.

Pool '986 discloses a leg assembly for a "delicate device" D that is susceptible to damage from shock or vibration transmitted through a conventional fixed leg assembly. The Pool '986 leg assembly comprises, in pertinent part, a leg L, a mounting M, and a biasing element E, such as a helical spring. The mounting M is attached to the supported device D, and is somewhat annular to define an open inner chamber. The leg L is hollow and adapted so that a portion 11 of the leg L is received in the inner chamber, and a portion 13 extends out of the mounting M. The biasing element E is received within the hollow center of the leg L and the inner chamber of the mounting M to bear against the leg L and thereby urge the leg L outwardly of the mounting M.

The portion 11 of the leg L can bear against a seat 30 in the mounting M to limit the travel of the leg L from the biasing effect of the biasing element E. The spring constant of the biasing element E is selected so that the weight of the device D urges the leg L inwardly relative to the mounting M against the force of the biasing element E, thereby "suspending" the device D on the biasing element E. This suspension will effectively isolate the device D from the supporting surface so that shock and vibration are not transmitted between the leg L and the device D.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, several basic criteria must be met. Under *Graham v. John Deere, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)*, it is necessary to 1) determine the scope and content of the prior art; 2) ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at

issue; 3) resolve the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and 4) evaluate evidence of secondary consideration. Additionally, the obviousness evaluation will be informed by a showing of teaching, suggestion, or motivation that would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the prior art to meet the claimed subject matter, although a rigid application of this showing is not required. The obviousness analysis must be explicit, and it is necessary to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the prior art elements in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. __; 127 S. Ct 1727; 82 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1385 (2007).*

Often, it will be necessary ... to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there **was an apparent reason** to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis **should be made explicit....Therefore, in formulating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed.** *May 3, 2007 Memorandum from Margaret A. Focarino, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations, to Technology Center Directors. (Emphasis in original.)*

A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,767,944 to Moore, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,426,986 to Pool. The rejection is traversed.

1. Lack of Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation

First, the Examiner has failed to determine the scope and content of the prior art, ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue, resolve the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, or evaluate evidence of secondary consideration with the explicitness required. The Examiner recites the components of the devices disclosed in Moore '944 and Pool '986, but does not explicitly determine the scope and content of Moore '944 or Pool '986. There is no explicit ascertainment of the differences between Moore '944 and Pool '986 and the claims at issue. The Examiner has failed to address at all the level of

ordinary skill in the pertinent art, and has failed to evaluate any evidence of secondary consideration. Furthermore, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation that would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Moore '944 with Pool '986 to meet the subject matter of claims 1, 2, 4, 19, and 21.

With respect to clam 1, the Examiner asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the boot of '986 as the particular boot of '944 with a reasonable expectation of success because '986 teaches a suitable means to isolate the force generated by the rotation of the basket or by a vibration generator." This is nothing more than after-the-fact rationalization based upon improper hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' invention. In effect, the Examiner finds two references, i.e. Moore '944 and Pool '986, and then concludes that it would be obvious to combine them, ignoring the absence of any teaching, suggestion or motivation to do so.

The Examiner identifies the shell 23 of the Moore '944 device as the boot called for in claim 1, and concedes that Moore '944 "does not teach a boot having multiple operational conditions comprising an isolating condition, where the boot substantially isolates the floor from forces generated by the rotation of the basket and acting through the foot, and a non-isolating condition, where the boot substantially passes the forces through the foot and into the floor." The Examiner then identifies element 13 of Pool '986 as a "boot," and asserts that element 13 could serve as the boot/shell 23 in Moore '944. The Examiner asserts, in effect, that element 13 of Pool '986 could be incorporated into the Moore '944 assembly to isolate the force generated by the rotation of the basket or by a vibration generator.

Element 13 of Pool '986 is identified in Pool '986 as a "foot" (*Pool '986, col. 2, ln. 53-55*), which is a part of the leg L ("In accordance with the invention, the leg L is a downwardly tapered cylinder form truncated at the foot 13." *Ibid., col. 2, ln. 59-61; see, also, Fig. 2*). Claims 1 and 21 call for a foot, and a boot mounted to the foot. It is clear from the claims, and from the specification, that the foot and boot are two separate, structurally distinct elements. Pool '986 does not show a boot separate and structurally distinct from a foot. Thus, there would be no reason to look to Pool '986 for a separate and structurally distinct boot that could be added to the Moore '944 device. Furthermore, the Examiner fails to

explain how the foot 13 of Pool '986 could be added to the Moore '944 assembly. Indeed, there is no reasonable way in which to substitute the foot 13 for the shell 23, and no rational purpose for doing so. Thus, there would be no reason to even attempt to add the foot 13 of Pool '986 to the Moore '944 assembly, and thus, no reason to consider Pool '986.

Claims 1 and 21 call for the boot to have multiple operational conditions. One operational condition is an isolating condition. A second operational condition is a non-isolating condition. With the isolating condition, the boot substantially isolates the floor from forces generated by the basket rotation or vibration generator. With the non-isolating condition, the boot substantially passes the forces through the foot and into the floor. The Pool '986 assembly does not operate in a non-isolating condition. It only operates in an isolating condition. ("...it is the leg structure per se which is treated herein and provided with features for illuminating the transmission of damaging shockwaves. In other words, structural continuity is interrupted insofar as transmission of energy is concerned.... With the four parts of the assembly related as thus far referred to, the transmission of energy through the leg assembly is disrupted and both vertical and lateral displacements and/or movements dampened." *Pool '986, col. 1, ln. 30-34, col. 2, ln. 4-8.*) Thus, because the device of Pool '986 only operates in an isolating condition, there would be no reason to consider Pool '986 for a device that operates in both an isolating condition and a non-isolating condition.

The Examiner has failed to offer any reasonable basis for combining Moore '944 and Pool '986. Indeed, as discussed above, there is no basis for doing so. Thus, the combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 cannot be sustained.

2. Combination Does Not Reach Device of Claims 1, 2, 4, 19, and 21

Even if the combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 were proper, which it is not, the resulting device would not reach the invention of claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, the Pool '986 assembly does not operate in a non-isolating condition. The Examiner concedes that the Moore '944 device does not include a boot operating in an isolating condition or a non-isolating condition. Thus, even if a device could be fabricated from a combination of the Moore '944 and Pool '986 devices, it would not reach the invention of claims 1 and 21 because it would not operate in a non-isolating condition.

Furthermore, it is not clear how such a device would be fabricated, and the Examiner has failed to describe what such a device would look like and how it would operate. Indeed, it appears that such a device would include a helical spring incorporated into the Moore '944 device, which would operate only in an isolating condition. This is not the invention of either claim 1 or claim 21.

Claims 1 and 21 are patentable over Moore '944 in view of Pool '986. Claims 2, 4, and 19 depend from claim 1 and, for the same reasons, are patentable over Moore '944 in view of Pool '986. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 19, and 21.

B. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944 and Pool '986, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,029,458 to Obata et al. The rejection is traversed.

Obata '458 discloses a horizontal axis washing and drying machine supported on rubber feet.

The rejection of claim 20 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Obata '458 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Obata '458 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Obata '458 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 20.

C. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944 and Pool '986, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,995 to Johnson. The rejection is traversed.

Johnson '995 discloses a washing machine 10 comprising a pump 18 supported on a base 20 within the washing machine 10. The pump 18 is supported by a flexible pump mount 32 comprising a pair of arms 38, which is in turn supported by a pair of mounting feet 34 which each include a flange 35 and a slot 36 formed between the feet 34 and the flange 35. The flexible arms 38 enable the pump 18 to move slightly relative to the mounting feet 34, and are selected to "isolate the pump vibration from the rest of the machine." *Johnson '995,*

col. 3, ln. 67 – col. 4, ln. 2. Thus, Johnson '995 discloses an assembly that operates in an isolating condition.

The rejection of claim 3 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Johnson '995 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Johnson '995 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Johnson '995 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 3.

D. Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944 and Pool '986, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0081405 of Healy. The rejection is traversed.

Healy '405 discloses a shoe having an outsole with articulating outsold lugs which deform or articulate when contacting the ground to adapt to normal loading of the shoe, thereby increasing the surface area contact between the shoe and the ground surface.

Healy '405 is nonanalogous art. "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).* "A reference is reasonably pertinent if, even though it may be in a different field from that of the inventor's endeavor, it is one which, because of the matter with which it deals, logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his problem." *Wang Laboratories Inc. v. Toshiba Corp., 993 F.2d 858, 864, 26 USPQ2d 1767 (Fed. Cir. 1993).* While Patent Office classification is some evidence of analogy, the similarities and differences in structure and function of the inventions disclosed in the references carry far greater weight. *In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 23 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1992).*

The first requirement has not been met. Healey '405 is in a field which is entirely different from the field of Applicants' invention. Healey '405 is directed to an outsole for footwear. This is entirely different from the field of art of Applicants' invention. Applicants'

invention is directed toward an assembly for supporting an appliance which can operate in both a force isolating condition and a force coupling condition. The two fields are completely unrelated.

The second requirement has also not been met. Healey '405 is not reasonably pertinent to the problem with which Applicants were concerned. The problem to be solved by Healey '405 is improving the traction of hiking boots on uneven terrain. *See, e.g., Healey '405, para. [0007].* The problem to be solved by Applicants' invention is controlling the coupling of vibratory forces from an appliance to a supporting floor. Healy '405 and Applicants' invention are directed to entirely unrelated problems. Healey '405, because it is concerned with improving the contact of hiking boots on uneven terrain, would not have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering the problem of isolating an appliance from a supporting floor in order to minimize the transfer of forces from the appliance to the floor. In effect, Healey '405 is directed to enhancing the transfer of forces to a supporting surface, directly the opposite of the focus of Applicants' invention.

The structure and function of the Healey '405 invention and Applicants' invention are significantly different. The Healey '405 invention comprises a series of articulating projections on the sole of a shoe which can flex in response to the weight of a hiker applied to the sole, and the topography of the terrain with which the sole is in contact. Applicants' invention comprises a metal foot and an overlying flexible boot which can deform in a controlled manner in order to operate in either a non-isolating or isolating condition. The structure and function of Applicants' invention is entirely different from the structure and function of the Healey '405 boot sole. Thus, Healey '405 is non-analogous art, the combination is improper as made, and the rejection based on the improper combination is not sustainable.

Moreover, the rejection of claims 5 and 14 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Healy '405 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Healy '405 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 5 and 14.

E. Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Healy '405, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,998 to Bader. The rejection is traversed.

Bader '998 discloses a crutch having a spring-biased shock absorbing portion attached to the foot of the crutch, which reduces shock on the user during use of the crutch.

The rejection of claims 6 and 7 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405 and Bader '998 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405 and Bader '998 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, and Bader '998 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 6 and 7.

F. Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, and U.S. Patent No. 3,601,345 to Johnson. The rejection is traversed.

Johnson '345 discloses a cup-shaped foot comprising an integrated spring element in order to provide vibration isolation to be supported structure. The cup shape of the foot provides a gripping action of the foot upon the supporting surface, which increases with the load applied to the foot.

The rejection of claims 8-10 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, and Johnson '345 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405, Bader '998, and Johnson '345 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, and Johnson '345 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 8-10.

G. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, and Johnson '345, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,382 to Midcap. The rejection is traversed.

Midcap '382 discloses a walking aid tip having an enlarged base, and a combination of convex and flat portions, which is made of a non-flexible rubber material, in order to improve the support of a walking aid, such as a cane, on smooth or slippery surfaces.

The rejection of claim 11 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, and Midcap '382 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, and Midcap '382 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, and Midcap '382 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 11.

H. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, and Midcap '382, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,947,882 to Levasseur. The rejection is traversed.

Levasseur '882 discloses a tip for a crutch or walking stick comprising a ball and socket joint incorporating a resilient material which connects a foot to the crutch/walking stick and which maintains the crutch/walking stick in a preselected position relative to the foot.

The rejection of claim 12 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, and Levasseur '882 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, and Levasseur '882 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, and Levasseur '882 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 12.

I. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, and Levasseur '882, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,593 to Greene et al. The rejection is traversed.

Greene '593 discloses a triangular-shaped tip for a walking stick which provides a broader base of support for the user.

The rejection of claim 13 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, Levasseur '882, and Greene '593 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, Levasseur '882, and Greene '593 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Healy '405, Bader '998, Johnson '345, Midcap '382, Levasseur '882, and Greene '593 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 13.

J. Claims 15, 22, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944 and Pool '986, and further in view of Bader '998. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claims 15, 22, and 28 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 15, 22, and 28.

J. Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998, and further in view of Healy '405. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claim 23 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Healy '405 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998 and Healy '405 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Healy '405 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 23.

K. Claims 16 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998, and further in view of Johnson '345. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claims 16 and 24 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Johnson '345 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998 and Johnson '345 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Johnson '345 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 16 and 24.

L. Claims 17 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998, and further in view of Midcap '382. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claims 17 and 25 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Midcap '382 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998 and Midcap '382 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Midcap '382 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 17 and 25.

M. Claims 18 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998, and further in view of Greene '593. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claims 18 and 27 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Greene '593 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998 and Greene '593 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Greene '593 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claims 18 and 27.

N. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Midcap '382, and further in view of Levasseur '882. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claim 26 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, Midcap '382 and Levasseur '882 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader '998, Midcap '382 and Levasseur '882 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, Midcap '382 and Levasseur '882 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 26.

O. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Moore '944, Pool '986, and Bader '998, and further in view of Johnson '995. The rejection is traversed.

The rejection of claim 29 over the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Johnson '995 is not supportable in that the base combination of Moore '944 and Pool '986 is not proper for the same reasons as previously discussed. The addition of Bader

'998, and Johnson '995 to the base combination does not address the failings of the base combination. Therefore, the combination of Moore '944, Pool '986, Bader '998, and Johnson '995 also fails.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of claim 29.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all claims remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
DANIEL C. CONRAD, ET AL.

Dated: August 24, 2007

By: /Michael F. Kelly/
Mark A. Davis, Reg. No. 37,118
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market Ave., SW; Suite 500
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 742-3500